Application No.:10/677,638 Amendment Dated: April 20, 2005 Reply to Office Action Mailed on March 9, 2005

L

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 are presented for consideration in this application. Claims 1-3 stand rejected and Claim 4 is indicated as being allowable if rewritten in independent form including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In view of the following remarks, the Applicants submit that all of these claims are clearly allowable and favorable action in that regard is earnestly solicited.

Claims 1-3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 5,491,998 to Hansen in view of US Patent No. 2,826,235 to Gudmestad and US Patent No. 4,899,566 to Knudson. This rejection is respectfully traversed. As defined by the Applicants' Claim 1, the only independent claim in this application, the Applicants' allows inventive arrangement independent adjustments at two roll forming stations in a rain gutter roll forming machine. These adjustments do not affect any of the other roll forming stations. One of the independent adjustments is to a pair of independently mounted kick rollers and the other independent adjustment is to a block used in conjunction with a roller to form a right angle bend at a particular location in the rain gutter.

Application No.:10/677,638

Amendment Dated: April 20, 2005

Reply to Office Action Mailed on March 9, 2005

4

The Examiner has cited Hansen for generally showing a machine which forms a rain gutter of the type with which the Applicants' claimed invention is concerned, and admits that Hansen fails to teach or suggest the particular improvements to the machine claimed by the Applicants. To make up for those deficiencies, the Examiner cites Gudmestad for its showing of kick rolls mounted on their own brackets and cites Knudson for its alleged showing of a block for forming a right angle bend in gutter. The Applicants submit that the Examiner the has incorrectly construed the Applicants' teaching of the claimed "block" which is used to form a right angle bend, since in the rejection the Examiner refers to mounting Hansen's rolls on blocks to form a right angle bend as taught by Knudson. According to the Applicants' teaching, and as set forth in Claim 1, it is the block 50 which is used in forming the right angle bend. The block 50 has nothing to do with mounting a roll. The Examiner also states that Knudson shows a rail 197 which functions in conjunction with rolls to form right-angled bends. However, Knudson's rail 197 is a guide rail which extends past several forming stations (see Fig. 1) and is not adjustable, in the Applicants' claimed arrangement where the forming block is mounted at a single forming station and is adjustable in position toward and away from a cooperating roller. The Applicants therefore submit that even if Hansen,

Application No.:10/677,638

Amendment Dated: April 20, 2005

Reply to Office Action Mailed on March 9, 2005

Gudmestad and Knudson were to be combined, this combination would not result in the arrangement set forth in the Applicants' Claim 1, with Claims 2 and 3 depending therefrom. Further, the arrangement defined in Claim 1 would not be obvious in view of such combination since none of the references teaches or suggests an adjustably mounted forming block, as claimed by the Applicants. Accordingly, the Applicants submit that Claims 1-3 are clearly patentable and respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of those claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen in view of Gudmestad and Knudson.

Claim 4 depends from Claim 1 and stands objected to as depending from a rejected base claim. The Examiner has indicated that this claim would be allowable if written in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim. In view of the foregoing discussion concerning Claim 1, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 4 is allowable as presently presented.

The prior art cited, but not relied upon, by the Examiner has been studied but is not deemed pertinent to the Applicants' claimed invention.

4

Application No.:10/677,638 Amendment Dated: April 20, 2005

Reply to Office Action Mailed on March 9, 2005

Claims 1-4 remain for consideration in this application. In view of the foregoing discussion, the Applicants submit that all of these claims are clearly allowable and favorable action in that regard is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, he is invited to telephone the undersigned at (908) 719-8961 to discuss this matter without the necessity for any further Office Action.

Respectfull submitted,

David L. Davis Reg'n. No. 24,812

Attorney for Applicants

90 Washington Valley Road Bedminster, NJ 07921 (908) 719-8961

DLD:ab